REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Claims

Prior to the entry of this Amendment, claims 1 and 4-50 were pending in this application. An Office Action mailed November 4, 2007 rejected all pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103. Claims 1, 36, 38, 39, and 44-46 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Hence, after entry of this amendment, claims 1 and 4-50 remain pending for examination. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application for at least the reasons presented below.

Amendments to the claims

Claims 1, 36, 38, 39, and 44-46 have been amended to recite the operations of "storing the identified accessibility context, retrieving the stored accessibility context, [and] playing back the stored accessibility context to test functionality of the component in reference to the accessibility context." Support for these amendments can be found at least at page 16, paragraph 0059 to page 17, paragraph 0063 and Figures 3a & 3b.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2

Claims 1 and 4-45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants submit that claims 1, 36, 38, 39, and 44-46 have been amended to overcome this rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 4-12, 20-27, 36, 38-42, and 44-45 under U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by "Java™ 2 Platform, Standard Edition, v1.2.2 API

Appl. No. 10/735,482
Amdt. dated February 4, 2008
Reply to Office Action of October 4, 2007

PATENT

Specification" ("**Java SE**"). This rejection is respectfully traversed, and it is submitted that the claims, at least as amended, are allowable over Java SE.

Java SE generally discloses an API specification for the Java 2 Platform, Standard Edition, version 1.2.2. This API specification includes a variety of Java packages, classes, methods, etc. Specifically, Java SE discloses a class "AccessibleContext" which represents the minimum information all accessible objects return. The information includes the accessible name, description, role, and state of the object. The AccessibleContext class includes a getAccessibleAt(Point p) method which returns an accessible child contained at the coordinate Point. AccessibleContext further includes the methods getAccessibleComponent(), getAccessibleRole() and getAccessibleAction(), which are used to manipulate an AccessibleContext object. (see Java SE at "class AccessibleContext" and "interface AccessibleComponet"). Ultimately, the AccessibleContext class allows for the retrieval of pointer data generated by an input device (e.g., a mouse).

Applicants respectfully submit that Java SE fails to teach or suggest the operations of "storing the identified accessibility context, retrieving the stored accessibility context, [and] playing back an event based on the stored accessibility context to test the event in reference to the accessibility context" as recited by claim 1, and similarly as recited by claims 36, 38, 39, and 44-46. Even though Java SE is able to retrieve pointer data, nowhere does Java SE teach or suggest storing such data and later retrieving the data to be used in testing an event, as recited by claim 1. Instead, Java SE simply makes accessibility tools available to retrieve point data; however, fails to store and retrieve such data, and test events using the retrieved data.

For at least these reasons, claims 1, 36, 38, 39, and 44-46 are believed to be allowable over Java SE. Dependent claims 4-12, 20-27, and 40-42 depend from claims 1 and 39 and therefore are believed to be allowable over Java SE at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable base claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action also rejected claims 13-18, 28-35, 37, 43, and 46-50 under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Java SE, in view of "Specification-based Testing for GUI-based Applications" by Chen et al. ("**Chen**").

Appl. No. 10/735,482
Amdt. dated February 4, 2008
Reply to Office Action of October 4, 2007

PATENT

The Office Action also rejected claim 19 under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Java SE, in view of Chen, and further in view of Official Notice.

Dependent claims 13-18, 19 28-35, 37, 43, and 47-50 depend from claims 1, 36, and 39. As noted above claims 1, 36, and 39 are allowable over Java SE, and it is believed that Chen does not remedy the failings of Java SE noted above. Hence, claims 13-18, 19 28-35, 37, 43, and 47-50 are believed to be allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from allowable base claims over Java SE and Chen, individually, or when combined in any combination.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles W. Gray/_____
Charles W. Gray
Reg. No. 61,345

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
CWG:slb
61215334 v1